

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 5, 2006, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present application has been amended in a manner which is believed to place it into consideration for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Applicants further note that since the present amendment incorporates subject matter previously considered as being allowable, no further search or consideration should be required.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oswald* (U.S. Patent No. 4,572,311) in view of *Leonhart* (U.S. Patent No. 3,809,004). Claims 1-3, 6, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Song* (U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0153184) in view of *Oswald* and *Leonhart*. Claim 12 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oswald* in view of *Zollinger* (U.S.P. No. 5,819,863) and *Leonhart*. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oswald* in view of *Turbowitz, et al.* (U.S.P. No. 4,540,376) and *Leonhart*.

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that not “all of the subject matter of claim 4” was included in claim 1 by the prior amendment. The examiner also asserts that an elastic member between the upper and lower supports does not distinguish the claim from the cited prior art. The Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment renders moot the above grounds of rejection by amending claim 1 to include allowable subject matter from former claim 4 that was previously incorporated into claim 5. Given that claim 5 was indicated as

containing allowable subject matter, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 should now be allowed, along with dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12 and 13.

In addition, as Applicants have noted before, independent claim 1 recites, in part, “a robot cleaner body,” which is not disclosed or suggested by *Oswald* or *Leonhart*, both of which are concerned only with all-terrain vehicles. For that additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections applying those references are improper for failing to teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims. Thus, those rejections should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants note that *Song* is assigned to Samsung Gwangju Electronics Co., Ltd., as is the present application, and is only available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). As such, Applicants respectfully assert that *Song* is inapplicable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, for that additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections applying *Song* are improper, and thus should be withdrawn.


Additionally, claims 7-9 and 11 have been allowed in the prior Office Action, so that all pending claims, 1-3 and 5-13 should now be allowed. For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application into better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Atty Docket No.: 116511-00125
U.S. Serial No.: 10/804,077
Reply to Office Action Dated July 5, 2006

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael C. Greenbaum
Registration No. 28,419

BLANK ROME LLP
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Telephone: (202) 944-3000
Atty. Docket No.: 116511-00148
Date: September 1, 2006
MCG/KFT/sdj